



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the dread lest the children should imbibe one with their frequent nips of the water, so I sat down, one warm afternoon, to watch the pail, to try to learn how the snakes came. In about ten minutes I saw a particularly plethoric cricket mount upon the edge of the pail, and, after some uneasy movements, bring the tip of the abdomen just beneath the water, and, with a few violent throes, expel a black mass, which fell slowly through the water, and before it reached the bottom resolved itself into one of the worms. The cricket seemed exhausted by the horrid birth, and did not find strength to draw itself up on the edge of the pail for about eight minutes, and when it finally did so, it tumbled to the floor and crawled off in a very rheumatic manner. After this discovery, we used to amuse leisure hours by watching like operations until frost killed the crickets. I sometimes would crush large crickets, generally with the result that a tightly-coiled snake would be thrust out of a rupture just above the tip of the abdomen; but, whether the snake was not sufficiently developed, or because of its needing water rather than air to vitalize it, none of the snakes so produced showed any signs of life."

The water snake alluded to is, of course, a species of our common *Gordius*, the same probably as that described, a number of years ago, by our distinguished President, Prof. Jos. Leidy. The fact that this animal is parasitic within the grasshopper, the speaker had himself observed; it has been said also to be parasitic within spiders, and doubtless has for its host many of the orthopterous genera. The point of greatest interest in the letter, Dr. McCook thought, is the fact that the crickets had evidently learned that the parasite infesting them required the water in order to make its egress, and had deliberately sought the suitable place and assumed the proper position (by inserting the abdomen beneath the surface of the water), necessary to insure that egress. It is a curious physiological question: how did the cricket obtain this knowledge? And, the knowledge having been obtained, the cricket's subsequent behavior presents an interesting fact in the study of insect intelligence.

A New Parasitic Insect upon Spider Eggs.—Dr. McCook further stated that he had received, through Mr. F. M. Webster (October, 1884), from Oxford, Indiana, a parasitised spider cocoon (evidently of some saltigrade species), apparently that of *Attus audax*. The cocoon contained within the outer flossy case about eighty cells and a number of mature black hymenopterous insects, about one-eighth of an inch long. The cells were ovoid, gray, blackish at the closed end, probably from excretions of the enclosed larvæ. One end was cut open, showing where the insect had escaped. With the exception of a few hard, dried, yellowish brown examples, all the eggs of the spider had disappeared. The specimens were sent to Mr. L. O. Howard, of the Bureau of

Entomology, Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., who judged them, after a cursory examination, to be Proctotrupids, belonging to the sub-family Sceliominæ, and seeming to form an entirely new genus. Thus appears to be added one more to the parasitic enemies of our spider fauna.

Rufus Sargent and W. Henry Grant were elected members.

The following were elected correspondents:—John Ball, of London; William Carruthers, of London; Rud. Leuckart, of Leipzig; Anton Dohrn, of Naples; A. Grenacher, of Halle i. S.; Alex. Götte, of Rostock i. M.; and Ludwig Will, of Rostock i. M.

DECEMBER 2.

The President, Dr. JOS. LEIDY, in the chair.

Thirty persons present.

DECEMBER 9.

Mr. J. H. REDFIELD in the chair.

Thirty-one persons present.

On Derivation in Pinus edulis and Pinus monophylla.—At the meeting of the Botanical Section, on December 8, Mr. THOMAS MEEHAN called attention to some dried specimens of *Pinus monophylla* on the table, which were received in a fresh condition, a few months ago, from Mrs. Lewers, of Franktown, Nevada. At that time the phyllodes which took the place of the real leaves, were all monophyllous. In drying, several had opened in some specimens, and others readily separated by a little aid, showing that the species might have been two-leaved, but for some inability in the early stages of development to separate them. This monophyllous species was closely allied to *Pinus edulis*, which was confined to the Rocky Mountains; the monophyllous species being the form that prevailed further west. But in a small tree of *P. edulis*, growing in a deep ravine in Queen Cañon, in the Rocky Mountains, he had found on the same tree monophyllous, diphyllous, and triphyllous phyllodes, and there could not possibly be any doubt that the species were of one origin. The case was one worthy of note, because it had been charged that there was no actual evidence of the truth of the doctrine of derivation. Generally when such evidences as these were offered, the objector was prepared to abandon his belief in the specific distinctness of the forms, rather than to grant that two distinct species had been developed from one parent, and even in the case of these species